

House, in order that they might decide what course should be adopted, and in order to ascertain what difference, if any, existed between the law of England and our law.

Mr. SCATCHERD said that when a somewhat similar case came up last session, it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for them to report thereon, and a Bill was introduced founded on their report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—That was Mr. PERRY's case, I believe.

Mr. SCATCHERD—Yes.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that in that case the hon. member had not taken his seat. If serious consequences were expected to follow, it would be well for the hon. gentleman who was supposed to represent Centre Wellington, not to take his seat in the meantime.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said the reason why the case which arose last session was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections was because there was some dispute about the facts. In the present case there was no dispute about the facts; it was perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman did vote before he took the oath, and the committee therefore would have nothing to do beyond what the Premier had already promised to do, to prepare a Bill for the consideration of the House. But the other suggestion was one that was worthy the consideration of the hon. member for Centre Wellington, namely; whether it was not advisable to wait until the Bill passed before he took his seat.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that these cases were referred in England to a Select Committee and here to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, although they might not involve any question of disputed facts, it being the function of the committee to search for precedents, and bring them before the notice of the House. The leader of this House had stated that he had found a precedent, and if that was the only one in existence, and no more light could be obtained, then it could be discussed in the full House at some future time. It appeared from the statement of the hon. gentleman that this was a much more serious question than he (Mr. BLAKE) had anticipated, and it, therefore, might be proper for the House to adopt the

Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald.

course suggested by the hon. member for Middlesex.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD asked the leader of the Government to allow the matter to stand over till to-morrow, so as to allow members an opportunity of examining the English case which had been brought forward, and the House would then be better able to decide whether the present case should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections or not.

The order was allowed to stand until to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 9.30.

—:~:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, February 25th, 1875.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read a first time.

Mr. BERNIER—To amend the Act relating to trade marks and industrial designs.

Mr. BROUSE—For the prevention of accidents entailing loss of life in breweries and distilleries. He explained that on Friday last, in the town of Prescott a valuable life had been lost by a person falling into a mash tub. During the past few years, no less than five lives had been lost in a similar manner in Prescott, and such accidents were of frequent occurrence in various parts of the Dominion. The object of this Bill was to prevent such accidents in future.

CARRIERS BY LAND AND WATER.

Mr. DEVLIN introduced a Bill defining and settling the duties, rights and responsibilities of carriers by land and also carriers by water. This Bill, he said, was founded on suggestions of the Dominion Board of Trade, and had been carefully prepared with a view to providing a remedy for the difficulties from which the commerce of this country had suffered for a long time past.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. member for Hamilton had introduced a Bill on the same subject.